U7870-1.70-F

NASIS

NEBRASKA ANNUAL SOCIAL INDICATORS SURVEY

Bureau of Sociological Research
Department of Sociology
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0325
Telephone: (402) 472-3672

NASIS-87, #9

NATURAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC POLICY: VIEWS ABOUT THE PROTECTION OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL AREAS

J. Allen Williams, Jr.

and

Helen A. Moore

Department of Sociology

April 1988

Price: $1.00

The Nebraska Annual Social Indicators Survey

David R. Johnson and Alan Booth, 1987 Study Co-Directors

The findings in this report are based on data collected in the Twelfth Nebraska Annual Social Indicators Survey (NASIS). This survey is part of an on-going study of the quality of life in Nebraska conducted by the Bureau of Sociological Research at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

In the Fall of 1987, a representative sample of 1882 Nebraskans eighteen years of age or older living in households was interviewed by telephone. The respondents were selected using a random digit telephone sampling design. The interview averaged approximately 30 minutes and included questions about work, recreation, attitudes towards public services, taxes, and political and social issues. Other items included in the survey measured the quality of life in the state. For the entire sample, 95 out of 100 times the percentages computed from the items asked on the survey are likely to be accurate to within plus or minus 2.3 percent of the figure that would have been obtained if each adult in Nebraska had been surveyed. This is an estimate of maximum error and for most items the percentages are likely to be even more accurate.

The data gathered by NASIS are used by a wide variety of state and local government agencies for policy and program planning and by faculty and students at the University of Nebraska and other colleges for research and training. No information identifying any respondent is released to any users and the strict confidentiality of individual respondents is rigidly enforced. While the final responsibility for the organisation and structure of the survey and for reports produced rests with the Bureau of Sociological Research, public agencies and university departments play an integral part in planning the survey through an Advisory Committee. Public organisations interested in membership on the Advisory Committee should contact the NASIS Study Directors.

Funding for NASIS comes from the University of Nebraska, the Bureau of Sociological Research, and state and local agencies which buy items and data analysis from the survey.

The NASIS surveys are repeated each year to measure change in the quality of life in Nebraska. While there is a core of questions which is included every year, each survey has a large component of unique items which address specific topical areas. Additional details on the NASIS surveys or questions regarding the use of the survey data or cost of purchasing items on future surveys can be obtained by contacting Alan Booth or David R. Johnson, NASIS Study Directors, at the Bureau of Sociological Research or by sending for a copy of the 1988 NASIS Prospectus.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC POLICY:
VIEWS ABOUT THE PROTECTION OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL AREAS

A wide range of issues confront Nebraskans with respect to the development and use of the state's land and water resources. Paramount among these is the question of what constitutes an appropriate balance between the protection of natural areas and wildlife on the one hand and the use of land and water for the needs of agriculture, industry and muncipalities on the other. While the two objectives are not necessarily mutually exclusive, it is clear that the growth and expansion of human population has decreased the amount of natural area and that many human activities have had adverse consequences for wildlife. Yet it is equally certain that both objectives, management and protection, are important for maintaining a high quality of life. We are aware, for example, of the benefits of water use for hydroelectric power and irrigation. We also know that natural areas not only provide the social and economic opportunity for nature-associated recreation, but that the interrelated network of plant and animal life that make up our ecological systems <u>requires</u> their preservation.

As part of the Fall 1987 NASIS survey, we asked a representative sample of 505 adult Nebraskans about seven different practices that relate to environmental management and habitat protection. All of these issues have become controversial and each has developed strong constituency groups. Each has and will continue to require policy decisions in both the private and public sectors of society. In developing policy it is both useful

and important to take into account and understand the values, interests and relevant behavior of those who will be affected by the decisions that are made.

In addition to knowing the overall distribution of attitudes related to an issue (the numbers for and the numbers against), it often is useful to know the characteristics of those who hold particular views. For example, if a policy is going to have a greater impact on farmers than others, it is valuable to know how farmers feel about the issue. Consequently, we analyzed people's views on the seven environmental issues by their level of education, family income, age, location in the state and whether the respondent lives in a farm household.[1]

We began by informing the respondents of our purpose. We said:

NOW I AM GOING TO READ SEVERAL STATEMENTS THAT DEAL WITH ALTERNATIVE USES OF NATURAL RESOURCES. FOR EACH STATEMENT, I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.

---

[1] People were grouped into education categories as follows: No Diploma/Degree; High School Diploma; Associate or Junior College (e.g., L.P.N.); Bachelor's Degree (or R.N.); Graduate Degree. Persons with Bachelor's degrees and those with graduate degrees were combined for the present analysis. Categories for family income and age are shown in the tables. The east-west division was done by using state planning regions. This division essentially compares the metropolitan east with the more rural west. The category "farm household" includes all households in which someone in the household was actively engaged in farming or ranching in 1987.

This was followed by seven statements asking respondents to choose between alternative uses of natural resources.[2]

ISSUE 1: TAKING NATURAL RESOURCES FROM WILDERNESS AREAS

The first statement asks people to weigh the value of taking natural resources from a wilderness area when this will result in a significant decline of the wildlife population. The statement is:

NATURAL RESOURCES MUST BE TAKEN FROM EXISTING WILDERNESS AREAS EVEN WHEN THE LOSS RESULTS IN MUCH SMALLER WILDLIFE POPULATIONS.

As can be seen from Table 1, among those having an opinion, 77.3 percent either disagree or strongly disagree that resources should be taken if it reduces the wildlife population. Very few, 1.8 percent, feel strongly that resources should be extracted under those circumstances.

Education and family income, indicators of socioeconomic status, appear to make no appreciable difference with respect to opinions about this issue. There is no significant difference by age nor between persons living in the eastern and western portions of the state. Persons living in farm households appear to be somewhat more likely than others to believe that resources must be removed; nevertheless, two-thirds of those in farm households say that resources should not be taken if a loss of wildlife will occur.

---

[2]The first five statements are based on work by Stephen Kellert in a national study, Public Attitudes Toward Critical Wildlife and Natural Habitat Issues (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979).

Table 1. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: NATURAL RESOURCES MUST BE TAKEN FROM EXISTING WILDERNESS AREAS EVEN WHEN THE LOSS RESULTS IN MUCH SMALLER WILDLIFE POPULATIONS.

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	1.8	21.0	22.8	55.0	22.3	77.3	462
Education							
No degree	2.9	21.7	24.6	63.1	12.3	75.4	34
High School	1.8	23.2	25.0	54.9	20.1	75.0	260
Junior College	2.1	20.9	23.0	58.2	18.8	77.0	39
College	2.2	15.9	18.1	59.1	22.7	81.8	88
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	0.9	25.8	26.7	49.4	24.0	73.4	113
15 - 29,999	2.1	21.9	24.0	59.4	16.5	75.9	179
30 - and up	2.9	22.5	25.4	56.7	17.9	74.6	126
Age							
18-24	0.0	22.6	22.6	60.6	16.8	77.4	73
25-39	1.2	20.6	21.8	53.3	24.9	78.2	162
40-59	2.4	23.8	26.2	58.1	15.7	73.8	134
60 and over	3.1	21.2	24.3	52.1	23.6	75.7	103
Region							
West	0.4	19.8	20.2	59.9	19.9	79.8	212
East	2.9	23.6	26.5	52.0	21.4	73.4	261
Household							
Farm	0.0	33.2	33.2	51.5	15.3	66.8	52
Non-farm	2.0	20.5	22.5	56.1	21.4	77.5	420

ISSUE 2: BUILDING A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON MARSH LAND

Whereas the first statement is not specific about the nature of the wildlife population that would be affected by the removal of resources, the second one provides more explicit information. The respondent, in effect, is asked to choose between using a marsh for a housing development and leaving it intact for "ducks and other non-endangered wildlife." The statement is as follows:

I APPROVE OF BUILDING ON MARSHES THAT DUCKS AND OTHER NON-ENDANGERED WILDLIFE USE IF THE MARCHES ARE NEEDED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

According to the responses shown in Table 2, a very large majority of Nebraskans, 85.4 percent, would prefer to preserve the marsh for wildlife. More than one in four strongly disagree with building the housing development while less than one percent strongly agree that it should be built. Persons with a high school education or above appear more likely more likely to

Table 2. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: I APPROVE OF BUILDING ON MARSHES THAT DUCKS AND OTHER NON-ENDANGERED WILDLIFE USE IF THE MARSHES ARE NEEDED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	0.7	14.0	14.7	59.0	26.4	85.4	486
Education							
No degree	1.4	15.1	16.5	69.7	13.7	83.4	35
High School	0.7	15.3	16.0	57.8	26.1	83.9	273
Junior College	0.0	19.3	19.3	54.5	26.2	80.7	43
College	0.0	13.8	13.8	62.1	24.1	86.2	87
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	1.0	15.6	16.6	60.1	23.3	83.4	118
15 - 29,999	0.0	15.4	15.4	61.9	22.8	84.7	184
30 - and up	1.0	13.4	14.4	58.2	27.5	85.7	133
Age							
18-24	0.0	25.2	25.2	57.3	17.5	74.8	74
25-39	0.0	10.8	10.8	60.9	28.3	89.2	161
40-59	0.9	15.7	16.6	57.4	26.1	83.5	145
60 and over	1.0	14.4	15.4	58.9	25.7	84.6	113
Region							
West	0.5	14.8	15.3	61.2	23.5	84.7	227
East	0.5	15.5	16.0	56.8	27.1	83.9	267
Household							
Farm	0.0	18.8	18.8	57.4	23.8	81.2	56
Non-farm	0.6	14.7	15.3	59.1	25.7	84.8	438

strongly disagree with building the housing as do people age twenty-five or older. By far the most important finding with respect to this issue is that the value of protecting a marsh for wildlife is widely shared among all Nebraskans, regardless of education, income, age, residential location or living in a farm or nonfarm household.

ISSUE 3: PLACING RESTRICTIONS ON OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

The third statement asks respondents to decide whether off-road vehicles should be allowed in areas where they might harm wild animals or disturb nesting areas. The statement is:

RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE USE OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLES SUCH AS SNOWMOBILES OR TRAIL BIKES, IF THEY HARM WILD ANIMALS OR DISTURB NESTING AREAS.

As can be seen in Table 3, there is near unanimity about this issue with 92.9 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing there should be restrictions placed on the use of off-road vehicles. Young people, 18 to 24 years of age, and those with less than a high school education appear less likely to strongly agree and perhaps slightly more likely to disagree, but even in these groups only small proportions say there should be no restrictions. Neither family income nor residential location in the state makes any difference in the opinions people have. Persons in farm households may tend to feel slightly less strongly about the issue, but, in fact, a slightly higher percentage of those in farm households say there should be restrictions if off-road vehicles harm wildlife or disturb nesting areas.

Table 3. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE USE OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLES SUCH AS SNOWMOBILES OR TRAIL BIKES, IF THEY HARM WILD ANIMALS OR DISTURB NESTING AREAS.

Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	33.9	59.0	92.9	6.2	0.9	7.1	492
Education							
No degree	21.4	67.1	88.5	11.5	0.0	11.5	36
High School	32.3	61.1	93.4	5.9	0.7	6.6	273
Junior College	33.9	62.9	96.8	3.2	0.0	3.2	41
College	39.6	53.8	93.4	0.4	0.2	0.6	91
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	34.6	55.2	89.8	8.4	1.8	10.2	120
15 - 29,999	32.7	62.5	95.2	4.6	0.2	4.8	187
30 - and up	34.9	58.9	93.8	5.2	1.0	6.2	136
Age							
18-24	19.0	70.7	89.7	10.3	0.0	10.3	73
25-39	34.9	57.2	92.1	6.5	1.4	7.9	162
40-59	36.9	57.2	94.1	5.3	0.6	5.9	147
60 and over	34.2	61.5	95.7	3.7	0.6	4.3	117
Region							
West	32.6	61.4	94.0	5.4	0.7	6.1	232
East	33.5	59.1	92.6	6.6	0.9	7.5	268
Household							
Farm	27.9	68.8	96.7	3.2	0.0	3.2	55
Non-farm	33.7	59.1	92.8	6.4	0.9	7.3	445

ISSUE 4: PLACING LIMITATIONS ON CATTLE AND SHEEP GRAZING

The fourth statement asks respondents to choose between higher meat costs and limiting cattle and sheep grazing on publicly owned land that destroys plants needed by wildlife, as follows:

CATTLE AND SHEEP GRAZING SHOULD BE LIMITED ON PUBLICLY OWNED LANDS IF IT DESTROYS PLANTS NEEDED BY WILDLIFE, EVEN THOUGH THIS MAY RESULT IN HIGHER MEAT COSTS.

The findings presented in Table 4 indicate that a majority of respondents in the state, 69.8 percent, believe grazing should be limited. The small differences in attitude by education, income, age and region appear to be random, indicating that these factors

Table 4. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: CATTLE AND SHEEP GRAZING SHOULD BE LIMITED ON PUBLICLY OWNED LANDS IF IT DESTROYS PLANTS NEEDED BY WILDLIFE, EVEN THOUGH THIS MAY RESULT IN HIGHER MEAT COSTS.

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	10.7	59.1	69.8	26.9	3.3	30.2	464
Education							
No degree	8.2	71.1	79.3	19.2	1.4	20.6	36
High School	11.2	56.9	68.1	28.7	3.3	32.0	260
Junior College	12.7	53.8	66.5	32.9	0.6	33.5	41
College	10.6	62.3	72.9	21.2	0.6	21.8	85
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	6.2	56.1	62.3	30.3	7.5	37.8	112
15 - 29,999	10.9	59.6	70.5	26.7	2.8	29.5	175
30 - and up	12.5	54.3	66.8	31.7	1.5	33.2	130
Age							
18-24	3.2	62.0	65.2	33.3	1.5	34.8	71
25-39	9.7	60.5	70.2	26.9	2.9	29.8	160
40-59	17.5	52.0	69.5	27.9	2.5	30.4	136
60 and over	7.6	57.5	65.1	28.5	6.4	34.9	104
Region							
West	10.3	58.5	68.8	29.4	1.9	31.3	216
East	10.7	57.0	67.7	27.8	4.6	32.4	256
Household							
Farm	10.3	63.8	74.1	25.0	0.9	25.9	55
Non-farm	10.5	56.9	67.4	29.0	3.7	32.7	416

are unrelated to people's position on the issue. One might imagine that farmers and ranchers would be more likely than others to believe that cattle and sheep grazing on public lands should be

allowed, but this is not the case. In fact, a slightly higher proportion of those in farm households agree that cattle and sheep grazing should be limited if it destroys plants needed by wildlife.

ISSUE 5: USING PESTICIDES

There is debate about whether pesticides are in fact necessary for maintaining current levels of food production, but the statement used in our survey asks people to decide between using and not using pesticdes if they are both necessary to maintain current production levels and harmful to wildlife. The statement is:

IF PESTICIDES ARE NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN THE COUNTRY'S FOOD PRODUCTION AT PRESENT LEVELS, WE MUST USE THEM EVEN IF THEY ARE HARMFUL TO WILDLIFE.

As can be seen from Table 5, only 16.8 percent of adult Nebraskans believe pesticides should be used under these conditions. There appears to be little difference in attitude by level of education, family income, age and region. Young people may not feel as strongly about the issue as the others, but about the same proportion feel pesticides should not be used. Persons in farm households tend to be more likely than others to believe that pesticides should be used, but, even so, two-thirds, 66.4 percent, disagree or strongly disagree that they should be used.

Table 5. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: IF PESTICIDES ARE NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN THE COUNTRY'S FOOD PRODUCTION AT PRESENT LEVELS, WE MUST USE THEM EVEN IF THEY ARE HARMFUL TO WILDLIFE.

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	1.0	15.8	16.8	56.9	26.4	83.3	467
Education							
No degree	0.0	19.1	19.1	68.7	12.1	80.8	33
High School	1.4	18.0	19.4	55.7	24.9	80.6	261
Junior College	0.0	14.5	14.5	56.8	28.7	85.5	42
College	0.0	17.8	17.8	53.6	28.6	82.2	84
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	0.0	16.5	16.5	54.1	29.4	83.5	109
15 - 29,999	0.8	18.0	18.8	63.6	17.5	81.1	180
30 - and up	1.7	17.8	19.5	55.8	24.7	80.5	131
Age							
18-24	0.0	26.9	26.9	54.1	18.9	73.0	68
25-39	1.3	11.0	12.3	59.6	28.1	87.7	156
40-59	0.7	18.0	18.7	58.5	22.8	81.3	142
60 and over	1.7	18.8	20.5	52.6	27.0	79.6	108
Region							
West	0.3	19.1	19.4	57.7	22.9	80.6	218
East	1.6	15.4	17.0	56.2	26.8	83.0	256
Household							
Farm	2.2	31.4	33.6	56.1	10.3	66.4	53
Non-farm	0.9	15.3	16.2	57.0	26.8	83.8	422

ISSUE 6: DIVERSION OF WATER FOR IRRIGATION

Before reading the sixth statement, we provided the respondents with the following background information:

SOME PERSONS HAVE SUGGESTED THAT IT WILL ECONOMICALLY BENEFIT LOCAL AREAS AND STATES TO DIVERT ADDITIONAL WATER FROM RIVERS TO IRRIGATE AGRICULTURAL CROPS. OTHER PERSONS FEAR THAT FURTHER LOSS OF RIVER WATER WILL THREATEN SOME WILDLIFE SPECIES WITH EXTINCTION AND FURTHER DETERIORATE THE RIVERS POTENTIAL AS A NATURE AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCE.

We then asked respondents:

WOULD YOU AGREE TO PROTECT THE ENDANGERED SPECIES OF BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE AND PRESERVE THE REMAINING RIVERS AND NATURAL AREAS ALONG THEIR SHORES, EVEN IF IT MEANT LIMITING THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF WATER THAT COULD BE DIVERTED FROM THE RIVERS FOR AGRICULTURAL USE?

As can be seen from Table 6, with 86.8 percent of the respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing, a large majority of the respondents favor limiting diversion if endangered species of

Table 6. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: WOULD YOU AGREE TO PROTECT THE ENDANGERED SPECIES OF BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE AND PRESERVE THE REMAINING RIVERS AND NATURAL AREAS ALONG THEIR SHORES, EVEN IF IT MEANT LIMITING THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF WATER THAT COULD BE DIVERTED FROM THE RIVERS FOR AGRICULTURAL USE?

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	20.9	65.9	86.8	11.4	1.8	13.2	466
Education							
No degree	13.4	55.9	69.3	30.7	0.0	30.7	35
High School	24.5	60.6	85.1	13.4	1.5	14.9	263
Junior College	13.4	73.5	86.9	11.5	1.6	13.1	40
College	18.7	68.7	87.4	11.2	0.1	11.3	80
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	25.0	56.0	81.0	18.5	0.5	19.0	109
15 - 29,999	19.3	65.6	84.9	13.1	2.0	15.1	181
30 - and up	15.9	66.8	82.7	14.6	2.7	17.3	131
Age							
18-24	8.5	65.3	73.8	24.4	1.8	26.2	71
25-39	18.6	65.7	84.3	14.5	1.2	15.7	154
40-59	23.0	61.7	84.7	14.3	1.0	15.3	139
60 and over	26.8	65.1	91.9	5.2	2.9	8.1	110
Region							
West	18.7	66.0	84.7	13.9	1.3	15.2	217
East	21.6	63.0	84.6	13.6	1.8	15.4	258
Household							
Farm	20.1	59.9	80.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	53
Non-farm	20.3	64.9	85.2	13.0	1.8	14.8	421

birds and other wildlife are threatened. Less than 2.0 percent strongly disagree with limiting diversion. Persons with less than a high school education have a lower percentage who believe diversion should be limited as do respondents between the ages of 18 and 24 compared to other age groups; nevertheless, both those with less education and the young adults have majorities favoring limitation. Eighty percent of persons in farm households say water diversion should be limited if it threatens wildlife and 85.2 person of those in non-farm households feel this way.

ISSUE 7: PRESERVING WET LANDS

Respondents were given the following information:

MANY RAINWATER BASINS, SMALL LAKES, PONDS, AND MARSHES HAVE BEEN DRAINED, LEVELED OR TILLED IN THE PROCESS OF EXPANDING AGRICULTURAL LANDS. SOME PERSONS FEAR THAT FURTHER DRAINAGE WILL THREATEN SEVERAL WILDLIFE SPECIES WITH EXTINCTION AND FURTHER DETERIORATE THE WET LANDS POTENTIAL AS A NATURE AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCE, WHILE OTHERS BELIEVE THAT LOCAL AREAS AND STATES WILL BENEFIT ECONOMICALLY FROM FURTHER AGRICULTURAL EXPANSION.

This was followed by a question asking respondents whether they believe the remaining wet lands should be preserved for wildlife, even if this limits available land for agricultural expansion:

WOULD YOU AGREE TO PRESERVE THE REMAINING WET LANDS AND PROTECT THE ENDANGERED SPECIES OF BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE, EVEN IF IT MEANT LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF LANDS THAT COULD BE USED FOR FURTHER AGRICULTURAL EXPANSION?

Examination of the findings in Table 7 shows that about nine of every ten Nebraskans, 90.2 percent, favor preserving wet lands to protect wildlife. Persons with less than a high school

education have a somewhat smaller percentage taking this position, 74.8 percent, than those with a high school diploma or above, but there seems to be no relationship between attitude toward preserving wet lands and family income, age, region, or farm versus non-farm household.

Table 7. RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT: WOULD YOU AGREE TO PRESERVE THE REMAINING WET LANDS AND PROTECT THE ENDANGERED SPECIES OF BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE, EVEN IF IT MEANT LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF LANDS THAT COULD BE USED FOR FURTHER AGRICULTURAL EXPANSION?

(Figures Given in Percentages)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Cases
Nebraska	22.3	67.9	90.2	9.3	0.5	9.8	474
Education							
No degree	12.1	62.7	74.8	25.2	0.0	25.2	36
High School	25.8	63.0	88.8	10.7	0.5	11.2	258
Junior College	19.7	76.5	96.2	3.8	0.0	3.8	41
College	20.2	73.0	93.2	6.7	0.0	6.7	89
Family Income							
$0 - 14,999	29.2	60.1	89.3	10.2	0.5	10.7	111
15 - 29,999	19.4	70.8	90.2	9.1	0.7	9.8	184
30 - and up	18.1	70.9	89.0	11.0	0.0	11.0	134
Age							
18-24	15.3	71.7	87.0	11.1	1.9	13.0	68
25-39	23.4	66.9	90.3	9.7	0.0	9.7	161
40-59	21.0	67.2	88.2	11.8	0.0	11.8	141
60 and over	22.8	70.3	93.1	6.4	0.5	6.9	113
Region							
West	19.0	72.2	91.2	8.6	0.3	8.9	220
East	23.5	65.3	88.8	10.7	0.5	11.2	262
Household							
Farm	16.1	75.5	91.6	8.3	0.0	8.3	53
Non-farm	22.1	67.6	89.7	9.9	0.4	10.3	429

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We began this report by noting that a number of controversial issues have arisen with respect to the development and use of Nebraska's land and water resources. In some instances the means of providing for the needs of agriculture, industry and the state's municipalities has led to the deterioration and loss of natural areas and wildlife habitat. We have asked Nebraskans their views about these issues. From our survey's results, it seems clear that the majority of the state's citizens feel that the remaining natural areas and wildlife should be protected, even if it means some sacrifice on their part. Furthermore, this does not appear to be a position held by any particular segment of society. The findings show sentiment for conservation and protection regardless of education, income, age, region of the state or whether one is a member of a farming or non-farming household. The issues and major findings are summarized below by restating each issue, the statement or question used to measure public opinion on the issue, and the majority response.

Issue 1: Taking natural resources from wilderness areas

Natural resources must be taken from existing wilderness areas even when the loss results in much smaller wildlife populations.

Majority view: 77.3% disagree or strongly disagree

Issue 2: Building a housing development on marsh land

I approve of building on marshes that ducks and other non-endangered wildlife use if the marshes are needed for housing development.

Majority view: 85.4% disagree or strongly disagree

Issue 3: Placing Restriction on Off-Road Vehicles

Restrictions should be placed on the use of off-road vehicles such as snowmobiles or trail bikes, if they harm wild animals or disturb nesting areas.

Majority view: 92.9% agree or strongly agree

Issue 4: Placing Limitations on Cattle and Sheep Grazing

Cattle and sheep grazing should be limited on publicly owned lands if it destroys plants needed by wildlife, even though this may result in higher meat costs.

Majority view: 69.8% agree or strongly agree

Issue 5: Using Pesticides

If pesticides are necessary to maintain the country's food production at present levels, we must use them even if they are harmful to wildlife.

Majority view: 83.3% disagree or strongly disagree

Issue 6: Diversion of Water for Irrigation

Would you agree to protect the endangered species of birds and other wildlife and preserve the remaining rivers and natural areas along their shores, even if it meant limiting the additional amount of water that could be diverted from the rivers for agricultural use?

Majority view: 86.8% agree or strongly agree

Issue 7: Preserving Wet Lands

Would you agree to preserve the remaining wet lands and protect the endangered species of birds and other wildlife, even if it meant limiting the amount of lands that could be used for further agricultural expansion?

Majority view: 90.2% agree or strongly agree

List of reports already released using data gathered in the 1987 Nebraska Annual Social Indicators Survey. These may be purchased at the indicated price from the Bureau of Sociological Research at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Report Number	Title
1	1987 NASIS Methodology Report: Study Design, Instruments, and Forms. David R. Johnson. Price: $7.50.
2	Majority Favor Higher Salaries For Legislators. Alan Booth. Price: $ .50.
3	Majority Favor Alternatives to Death Penalty. Alan Booth. Price: $1.00.
4	Support Concept of Living Wills. Alan Booth. Price: $ .50.
5	Solid Waste Disposal Site Regulation. Alan Booth. Price: $ .50.
6	Surrogate Mothering. Alan Booth. Price: $ .50.
7	High School Pregnancy Prevention Clinics. Alan Booth. Price: $ .50.
8	Nebraskans' Participation in Nature-Associated Recreation in the Platte River Valley. J. Allen Williams, Jr. and Helen A. Moore. Price: $1.00.